



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,622	12/27/2001	Yung-Hsin Chen	CHEN3317/EM	9061

23364 7590 01/25/2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/026,622	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin A Ailes	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/27/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 have been examined.
2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Drawings

3. The drawings received on 12/27/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rao et al. (U.S. 5,987,516), hereinafter referred to as Rao et al.
6. Regarding claim 1, Rao et al. teach a method for previewing a MIB (Management Information Base) group table in a SNMP (Simple Network Management Protocol) network device, prior to enabling a NMS (Network Management Station) to read or set with respect to one of the MIB group tables in at least one SNMP network device, the method comprising:
 - Transmitting a packet having preview facility from the NMS to the network device (col. 4, lines 61-66 and col. 5, lines 8-10, col. 8, lines 53-56);

Art Unit: 2142

- After the network device has received the packet, transmitting items in the MIB group table which supports the SNMP back to the NMS in a reply packet (col. 4, lines 37-51); and
- Enabling the NMS to perform an analysis on the reply packet so as to preview items of the MIB group table in the network device which support SNMP (col. 4, lines 37-51, specifically lines 39-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rao et al. as applied above, in further view of Champlin et al. (U.S. 6,519,635), hereinafter referred to as Champlin et al.

9. Regarding claim 2, Rao et al. teach the use of the SNMP format (col. 4, lines 44-48), but are silent on the use of an object identifier (OID) string which is an OID of the MIB group table. However, in art related to information gathering from an MIB group table, Champlin et al. disclose a SNMP transmission having an OID string which also identifies the MIB group table (col. 2, lines 7-9 and lines 20-21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the SNMP transmission method provided by Rao et al. with the

Art Unit: 2142

OID string method provided by Champlin et al. in order to easily distinguish requests and identify the network element in question (col. 2, lines 7-9)

10. Regarding claim 3, in accordance with claim 2, Rao et al. teach the use of the SNMP format (col. 4, lines 44-48), but are silent on the use of an object identifier (OID) string which is an OID of the MIB group table. However, in art related to information gathering from an MIB group table, Champlin et al. disclose a SNMP transmission having an OID string which also identifies the MIB group table (col. 2, lines 16-40, specifically lines 20-21). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the SNMP transmission method provided by Rao et al. with the OID string method provided by Champlin et al. in order to easily distinguish requests and identify the network element in question (col. 2, lines 7-9)

11. Regarding claims 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, in accordance with claims 1, 4, 4, 4, and 4, respectively, Rao et al. teach the use of packets in order send messages (col. 4, lines 61-66), but are silent on the format used. However, in art related to information gathering from an MIB group table, Champlin et al. disclose the standard format of PDUs (col. 2, lines 37-45 and 58-64, and Fig. 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the packet use method provided by Rao et al. with the packet data format method provided by Champlin et al. in order to achieve appropriate traffic flow and control in a network (col. 2, lines 61-62) and to determine the compatibility with the SNMP format.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chari (U.S. 6,151,023) discloses an apparatus for organizing and displaying management information regarding the hardware and software components in a computer network.

McHann, Jr. (U.S. 5,991,806) discloses a dynamic system control via messaging in a network management system.

George et al. (U.S. 5,774,669) disclose a scalable hierarchical network management system for displaying network information in three dimensions.

Schunicht et al. (U.S. 6,779,027) disclose the use of intelligent management module application programming interfaces with utility objects.

Bapat (U.S. 5,317,742) discloses a dynamic translation of network management primitives to queries to a database.

Spofford et al. (U.S. 5,913,037) disclose a dynamic management information base manager.

Fee et al. (U.S. 5,812,771) disclose a distributed chassis agent for distributed network management.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes, whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-5).

Art Unit: 2142


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached at (571) 272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-3906.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [benjamin.ailles@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Benjamin Ailes
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142


JACK HARVEY
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER